

REMARKS**I. Introduction**

In response to the Office Action dated March 30, 2007, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, and 5 – 7 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 – 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to include a feature of canceling the stop of the clock signal and canceling the wait request signal, respectively, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 3, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,087 to Fadavi-Ardekani in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,780,843 to Tietjen. Claim 7 stands rejected under § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Fadavi-Ardekani in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,102 to Peters. Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Fadavi-Ardekani in view of Peters. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, an information processing apparatus comprising access arranging means for canceling the clock stop of the second data input/output means and starting the access of the second data input/output means after the access of the first data input/output means is ended, and further, for causing the clock signal to the second data

input/output means not to be stopped when an access of the first data input/output means is generated but an access of the second data input/output means is not generated. In accordance with this configuration, if the second unit does not access the memory, the data signal of the second unit may be operated.

The Examiner asserts that Fadavi-Ardekani discloses access arranging means as recited in claim 1, and relies on Tietjen only for the alleged disclosure of a wait power mode resolution system. However, neither reference, alone or in combination with each other, discloses or suggests causing the clock signal to the second data input/output means not to be stopped when an access of the first data input/output means is generated but an access of the second data input/output means is not generated. In fact, in Fadavi-Ardekani, if the second unit does not access the memory, the clock signal of the second unit *cannot* be operated. Thus, clearly, the cited references do not disclose or suggest every feature of claim 1.

Independent claims 2, 5, and 6 contain similar recitations to those described above in reference to claim 1. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest every feature of these claims for at least the reasons described above.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from one of the independent claims. Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Harness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as the independent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

IV. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:DAB
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 2, 2007